REMARKS

Claims 1 through 12, and 15 through 18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, and 16 are amended by this response. Claims 5, 7, 8, 9, 17 and 18 are canceled by this response. The support for the claim amendments is as follows: Claims 1 and 10 (Specification page 18 lines 8 through 13). No new matter is added.

Claims 5, 6, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nichol (USP 3,313,218). (Office Action p. 2)

Claims 5, 17 and 18 are canceled and claim 6 is now dependent from claim 1, a non-rejected claim, making this rejection moot.

Claims 5, 6, 10, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ballard (USP 3,940,525). (Office Action p. 2)

Claims 5 and 18 are canceled and claim 6 is now dependent from claim 1, a non-rejected claim.

Ballard discloses a method wherein a **hot melt adhesive is coated onto the under surface of a substrate**, specifically carpet. (Ballard Figure 1) Ballard discusses feeding soft carpet through several rollers to straighten, smooth, and hold the carpet down and press the carpet onto the surface of the hot-melt adhesive applicator roller firmly enough to wipe adhesive onto the underside of the carpet. (Ballard at column 4, lines 32 through 37)

Ballard does not teach or suggest placing the pool of hot melt adhesive above the rollers to control the quantity or distribution of the hot melt adhesive applied onto the rollers. Further, Ballard uses pressure of several rollers to wipe adhesive onto the material to

be coated and does not teach or suggest placing the hot melt adhesive on the top surface of the material to be coated as in the claimed invention.

The device and methd of Ballard are completely differnt than that of the invention now claimed. The reference therefore cannot anticipate.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) in view of Nichol and Nagata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,332,786). (Office Action p. 3)

Claims 5, 7 through 9, 17 and 18 are canceled and claim 6 is now dependent from claim 1, a non-rejected claim.

The cited references Nichol and Nagata, alone or in combination, do not enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to achieve the present invention.

In the method of joining waxed paperboard disclosed in Nichol and as shown in Figure 2 of Nichol, hot melt glue is **first drawn upward from a glue pot positioned under the wax covered paper** using a glue applying wheel 8, and then is **coated onto the under surface** of a flap of a wax covered paper. Further, as shown in Figure 3, glue is coated onto both sides of the wax covered paper. In such a structure, it is difficult to control the coating quantity of the glue correctly.

In Nichol, the glue coated onto the under surface of the wax covered paper is affected by gravity, and therefore, the glue forms irregularities on the surface thereof rather than penetrating deep into the paper. The claimed invention is affected positively, not negatively, by gravity because the top surface of the wood board in the claimed invention is coated with

the hot melt adhesive and therefore penetrates downward into the wood board. Anchoring the adhesive onto the substrate sufficiently is not expected in the process disclosed by Nichol, and adhesiveness would therefor be insufficient compared to the adhesiveness achieved by the claimed invention.

Also, the hot melt adhesive of the claimed invention is first kept in a valley 8 (a pool) formed by the two rollers, which adjusts the quantity of the adhesive applied and sent to the surface of the applicator roller, and then to the upper surface of the wood board. The **quantity and distribution of the adhesive on the rollers (and eventually the substrate) of the claimed method is better** because of the location of the adhesive pool between the applicator roller and the metering roller, than in Nichol where the glue pot is positioned under the wax.

The rejection cited Nagata for disclosing a hot melt adhesive. The adhesive of Nagata is applied with the use of a hotmelt applicator such as a hotmelt coater, a hotmelt spray and the like. (Nagata column 3, lines 28 through 30). Further discussion of the application of the adhesive of Nagata is not provided.

Neither reference teaches or **suggests placing the pool of glue above the rollers to control the quantity or distribution of the hot melt adhesive** applied onto the rollers or **placing the hot melt adhesive on the top surface of the material to be coated.** Therefore, neither reference, alone or in combination, can logically teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By [signature] (56,955)

James E. Armstrong, IV
Registration No.: 42,266
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874, Boston, MA 02205
(202) 478-7370
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant